



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/671,147

09/24/2003

Mahendra Madhukar Patil

132071

4557

6147 7590 10/20/2008
GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY
GLOBAL RESEARCH
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59
NISKAYUNA, NY 12309

EXAMINER

STINSON, FRANKIE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1792

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/20/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ldocket@crd.ge.com
rosssr@crd.ge.com
parkskl@crd.ge.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/671,147	Applicant(s) PATIL ET AL.	
	Examiner /FRANKIE L. STINSON/	Art Unit 1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1792

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, , 41, 42 and 43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Kim (U. S. Pat. No. 5,590,552 or Urban (U. S. Pat. No. 3,335,584) in view of either Beck or Beck (U. S. Pat. No.1,895,307) or Wing (U. S. Pat. No. 1,405,243).

Re claims 20 and 36, note that Kim is each cited disclosing a fluid-dispenser device (20) for a washing machine having a wash basket (4) rotatable about a vertical axis and, defining radii extending in a horizontal plane relative to a circumference in correspondence with respect to said wash basket, the device comprising:

at least two ports (24a, 24b) positioned on a common horizontal plane to direct respective jets of fluid into a wash basket, each of the jets having a generally parallel relationship with respect to one another that differs from the claim only in the specific recitation of the at least two ports being along a common radius.

Re claims 20 and 36, note that Urban is cited disclosing a fluid-dispenser device (52) for a washing machine having a wash basket (24) rotatable about a vertical axis and, defining radii extending in a horizontal plane relative to a circumference in correspondence with respect to said wash basket, the device comprising:

at least one port (90) positioned along a radius in a horizontal plane to direct a jet of fluid into a wash basket that differs from the claim only in the recitation of at least two ports positioned along a common radius, with each of the jets having a generally parallel relationship with respect to one another. The patents to Beck and Wing are each cited disclosing the arrangement of at least two ports position along a common radius in a common horizontal plane. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement of Kim, to have the ports positioned along a common radius as taught by either Beck or Wing, for the purpose of evenly supplying the washing fluid. Also, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement of Urban, to have at least two ports positioned along a common radius as taught by either Beck or Wing, for the purpose of evenly supplying the washing fluid. It is old and well known to modify supply arrangements to supply wash fluid in various configurations (see MPEP 2144.04 REVERSAL, DUPLICATION OR RE-ARRANGEMENT OF PARTS). All of the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Re claim 24, Kim and Urban each disclose the adjacent ports. Re claims 25 and 26, Kim and Urban disclose the multiple sets. Re claim 29, Kim and Urban disclose the ports positioned as claimed. Re claims 27 and 30, Kim and Urban disclose the annular ring. Re claim 32, Kim and Urban disclose the common radius as claimed. Re claims 33-35, 42 and 43, Kim and Urban disclose the cycle. Re

Art Unit: 1792

claims 40 and 41, Kim and Urban disclose the relative motion and impinging direction as claimed.

3. Claims 21 and 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claims 1 and 36 above, and further in view of Rodriguez (U. S. Pat. No. 5,937,877), Mattix (U. S. Pat. No. 6,451,126), Perez (U. S. Pat. No. 4,545,528), or Cook (U. S. Pat. No. 3,612,075) .

Claim 21 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of exit velocity. Rodriguez (col. 12, lines 39-51), Perez (col. 4, lines 26-33), Mattix (col. 5, lines 18-29) and Cook (col. 3, lines 44-73) are each cited disclosing the exit velocity as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement of either Kim or Urban, to include exit velocities as taught by Rodriguez, Perez, Mattix or Cook, for the purpose of thoroughly supplying the wash fluid.

4. Claims 22, 23, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claims 1 and 36 above, and further in view of Hahn (U. S. Pat. No. 2,480,921), Pierce (U. S. Pat. No. 3,322,347) or Lenz et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 2,577,136) .

Claims 22, 23, 38 and 39 define over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the inclination angle. Hahn, Pierce and Lenz are each cited disclosing the inclination angle. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement of either Kim or Urban, to inclination angle as taught by Hahn, Pierce and Lenz, for the purpose of thoroughly supplying the wash fluid.

Art Unit: 1792

5. Claims 18 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art as applied to claims 20 and 36 above, and further in view of either Holden (U. S. Pat. No. 2,161,047) or Beach (U. S. Pat. No. 2,570,021).

Claims 28 and 31 define over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the ring being segmented/branched. Beach and Holden each disclose the segmented ring as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement Kim or Urban to have the ring segmented/branched as taught by either Holden or Beach, for the purpose for allowing for easy installation.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims and/or the rejection thereof have been considered. The arguments and/or amendments with respect to the claims have been effective in defining over previous Office Action, with the current remarks standing moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 1792

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/FRANKIE L. STINSON/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792